

C. Remarks

The claims are 1 and 4-6 with claim 1 being independent. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. Applicants submit that the amendments made herein are fully supported throughout the application as filed; accordingly, no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,289) in view of Casey (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,499), Iwasaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,328,403) and Clark (U.S. Patent No. 7,265,856). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe as modified by Casey, Iwasaki and Clark and further in view of Iwasaki '961 (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0175961). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As noted by the Examiner at the top of page 8 of the Office Action, the combination of Watanabe and Casey is deficient in at least several key respects. More specifically, the combination of Watanabe and Casey fails to teach each first region being divided into a plurality of second regions in correspondence with the number of color components and fails to teach determination of the code and storing means for storing N column data transferred on the basis of the code determined by said acquisition means. The Examiner contends, however, that Iwasaki remedies those deficiencies. Applicants believe that the combination of Watanabe and Casey is deficient in respects beyond those noted by the Examiner and that Iwasaki does not remedy those deficiencies.

In Iwasaki, at the portion bridging columns 7 and 8, it is described that separate print buffers (618K, 618C, 618M and 618Y) are provided for each color. Each buffer stores raster data for a prescribed number of bands. This is entirely different from

the present invention wherein a print buffer is divided into a plurality of first regions corresponding to divided regions of the printing medium and wherein each first region of the buffer is divided into a plurality of second regions corresponding to color components. Because the above-noted structure of Iwasaki is completely different from that presently claimed, Applicants fail to see how Iwasaki could remedy the deficient disclosure of Watanabe and Casey.

Furthermore, as noted by the Examiner on page 9 of the Office Action, the combination of Watanabe and Casey and Iwasaki is deficient in at least one key respect. More specifically, the combination of Watanabe and Casey and Iwasaki fails to teach a configuration in which the block data contains a code representing a data delimiter between first color component data and second color component data. The Examiner contends, however, that Clark remedies this deficiency. Applicants believe that the combination of Watanabe and Casey and Iwasaki is deficient in respects beyond those noted by the Examiner (see above) and that Clark does not remedy those deficiencies.

In Clark, a data stream 410 of cyan, a data stream 420 of magenta and a data stream 430 of yellow are described on lines 31 to 61, column 5 and Fig. 4. The data are transferred in order of M1, Y1, C1, M2 and Y2. However, Clark does not disclose that codes are arranged between M1 and Y1 or Y1 and C1. Further in Clark, it is described on lines 57 to 67, column 6 and Fig. 7 that data 712 and 713 are generated by sandwiching empty data 714. However, the data 714 is empty data and is arranged between the same color data Y1 and Y1. The data 714 is not a code that is arranged between different color data as is presently claimed. Accordingly, Applicants fail to see how Clark could remedy the deficient disclosure of Watanabe and Casey and Iwasaki.

In sum, even when looking at the combined disclosure of Watanabe, Casey, Iwasaki and Clark, key features of the present invention are not disclosed or suggested. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest block data containing a plurality of color component data and a code representing a data delimiter between a first color component data and a second color component data. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not obvious over the cited art and request withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and passage to issue is earnestly requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elizabeth F. Holowacz/
Elizabeth F. Holowacz
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 5103316_1